

**IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Patent Application

Inventor(s):	Yoad Gidron et al.	Serial No.:	10/573,832
Case:	Mobilitec 5	Filed:	12/05/2006
Examiner:	Choo, Munsoon	Group Art Unit:	2617
Confirmation #:	5200		

Title: SERVICE PLATFORM FOR CELLULAR TELEPHONY

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450**

SIR:

APPEAL BRIEF

Appellants submit this Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on appeal from the decision of the Examiner of Group Art Unit 2617 mailed November 6, 2009 rejecting claims 36-68.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this appeal brief to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this appeal brief, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for.

Appellants do not believe that any fees are due. In the event Appellants are incorrect, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees to Deposit Account No. 50-4802/**ALU/MOBILITEC5**.

Table of Contents

1.	Identification Page.....	1
2.	Table of Contents	2
3.	Real Party in Interest	3
4.	Related Appeals and Interferences	3
5.	Status of Claims	3
6.	Status of Amendments	3
7.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	3
8.	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	7
9.	Arguments	8
10.	Conclusion	18
11.	Claims Appendix	19
12.	Evidence Appendix	25
13.	Related Proceedings Appendix	25

Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Alcatel Lucent.

Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellants assert that no appeals or interferences are known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Status of Claims

Claims 36-68 are pending in the application. Claims 1-33 were originally presented in the application. Claims 34-68 were added by amendment. Claims 1-35 have been cancelled. Claim 36 has been amended. The rejection of claims 36-68 is appealed.

Status of Amendments

All claim amendments have been entered.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Embodiments of the present invention are generally directed to apparatus and methods for providing a platform for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network. The apparatus comprises an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service. The generic definition incorporates common features of different services and is able to take specific service-defining parameters, wherein the infrastructure facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols. The apparatus further comprises an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to the generic definition, to thereby implement a desired service through said generic definition. The generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices. The method comprises providing a generic definition of a cellular service, the generic definition incorporating common features of different services, and the generic definition is able to take specific service-defining parameters wherein the cellular telephone network facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different

protocols, and for each one of a plurality of desired services, inputting respective service defining parameters to the generic definition, to thereby implement a desired service through the generic definition wherein the generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.

For the convenience of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, Appellants' independent claims 36, 45, 51 and 62 are presented below with citations to various figures and appropriate citations to at least one portion of the specification for elements of the appealed claims.

Claim 36 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

36. (Previously Presented) Apparatus providing a platform for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network, the apparatus comprising: (FIG. 1, 10)
an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters, wherein the infrastructure facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols; and

(FIG. 2, Pg. 4:1-32; Pg. 9:11-Pg. 11:3; Pg. 12:23-29; Pg. 13:20-25)

an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition, said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices. (Pg. 2:16-18; Pg. 4:23-27; Pg. 3:19-29).

Claim 45 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

45. (Previously Presented) A method for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network comprising:

providing a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, and said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters wherein the cellular

telephone network facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols, and (FIG. 2, Pg. 4:1-32; Pg. 9:11-Pg. 11:3; Pg. 12:23-29; Pg. 13:20-25)

for each one of a plurality of desired services, inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices. (Pg. 4:5-27).

Claim 51 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

51. (Previously Presented) A method for managing a content delivery interface between a content provider and a subscriber wireless communication device, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of modules for the content delivery interface, each module for providing content as part of a different service wherein delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols is facilitated; (Pg. 4:31-32)

providing a generic definition of said service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services; selecting an appropriate one of said modules for the content delivery interface according to a currently desired service and said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices; and (FIG. 2, Pg. 4:1-32; Pg. 9:11-Pg. 11:3; Pg. 12:23-29; Pg. 13:20-25)

adding said appropriate module to the content delivery interface, thereby to provide said currently desired service from a platform that supports a plurality of services. (Pg. 4:6-24).

Claim 62 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

62. (Previously Presented) A service delivery platform for an interface between a content provider and a wireless communication device, comprising: (FIG. 6, Pg. 19:20-Pg. 20:21)

a plurality of services for being provided to the wireless communication device by the content provider; (FIG. 7, 112, 114; Pg. 20:9)

an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services; (FIG. 2, Pg. 9:29-31; Pg. 4:1-32)

a service controller for receiving a request for a service from the wireless communication device and for activating said service according to a service logic and said generic definition, wherein said service logic comprises at least one rule for determining at least one of whether and how said service is to be provided; and (FIG. 7, 110; Pg. 20:7-8; Pg. 6:20-23)

a service framework, configured to enable ones of said services to be added, removed or changed. (FIG. 6; Pg. 6:24-25).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

I. Claims 36, 38-45, 47-53, 58, 61-62, 64-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheat, Tammy (Pub. # WO 03/067851, hereinafter “Tammy”).

II. Claims 37 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claims 36 and 45 above, and further in view of Wenocur et al. (Pub#2003/0041110, hereinafter “Wenocur”).

Claims 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claims 52 and 53 above, and further in view of Forstadius (Pub#2004/0110462, hereinafter “Forstadius”).

Claims 59 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claims 58 and 62 above, and further in view of Montemer (Pub#2004/0023644, hereinafter “Montemer”).

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claim 58 above, and further in view of Croome (Pub#2005/0101309, hereinafter “Croome”).

ARGUMENTS

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 36, 38-45, 47-53, 58, 61-62, 64-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheat, Tammy (Pub. # WO 03/067851, hereinafter “Tammy”).

A.1. Rejection of claim 36.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy. Appellants urge to the contrary.

1. *The Examiner failed to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness because Tammy fails to teach or suggest all the claim elements.*

Appellants initially¹ show error in the rejection of claim 1 in that the Examiner failed to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of obviousness². *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In reply to the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief of September 24, 2009, the Examiner reopened prosecution issuing a new Office Action. On page 2 of the new Office Action, the Examiner asserts that new grounds of rejections are established. However, the rejection went from §102 to §103 with the same single reference without taking differences between the reference disclosure and the claims into account as a rejection under §103 would ordinarily do. No Official Notice was taken and the differences between the reference disclosure and the claims were not accounted for under any theory. Further, the Office Action is replete with incomprehensible notes unconnected to any specific limitation making it quite difficult to ascertain the veracity of the Examiner’s assertions.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is still not established even with these deficiencies, because Tammy is deficient and the Examiner fails to account for the differences between Appellant’s claimed embodiments and Tammy.

¹ In the Appeal Brief filed September 24, 2009, Appellants argued that the claims were erroneously rejected.

² In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shifts to the Appellant only if the Examiner’s burden is met. Id. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP 2143.03. See also, *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). If the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Now, turning to the Office Action, in rejecting independent claim 1, the Examiner alleges that Tammy discloses Appellants' claimed features. Appellant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Tammy fails to teach or suggest at least:

"an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters" and "an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition," as recited in Appellants' independent claim 36.

In an effort to support the rejection, the Examiner cobbled together some teaching and juxtaposes the passage believed to disclose the claimed feature "an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services." The remarks are reproduced here for ease of reference.

"Abstract: services such as (1) finding (find-ability or discoverability) a restaurant (or doctor or theater in fig. 19), (2) passing real-time information between the restaurant and the mobile user and (3) managing (obtaining or providing) reservation. These different services are (incorporated) provided by Tammy's apparatus; fig 6: Multiple modules (of different services) are incorporated) said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining (Tammy, claim 16:query for info (service) and request for a reservation (service) require the input of specific parameters; page 11 line 5: rules of user)." (See Office Action page 5).

However, on page 2 of the June 29, 2009 Office Action, the same Examiner then asserted:

"Abstract, the figure shows an infrastructure providing services to mobile station and the network through the exchange point B2B engine. The B2B engine (generic definition) incorporates services such as finding a restaurant for a mobile device user, and passing real-time information between the restaurant and the mobile user."

It is unclear why the same limitation is interpreted so very differently from one Office Action to the next. However, what appears to be certain is that on page 3 at line 9 of Applicants' specification, the phrase: "generic definition" is disclosed as comprising an ability to select between one of a plurality of levels of complexity of content

presentation according to a determined capacity level of a receiving telephone. Tammy is silent about “generic definition” because Tammy’s objective lies elsewhere, e.g., finding a nearby fixed station such as a restaurant. (See Abstract).

Accordingly, Appellants’ claim 36 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tammy.

2. *The Examiner Disregards The Clear Teachings of The Specification.*

Further, the Examiner improperly breaks the claim element into small portions and try to use the cited reference to piece together teachings of those portions. In this case as in any case, a sufficiently fine-grained portioning of claim terms results in claim sub-terms in which all context is lost. Similar-sounding language within a reference is then pronounced as being equivalent to the sub-terms to effect thereby a teaching of the claim term. This is intellectually and procedurally improper.

As articulated above, the specification provides a clear context for persons skilled in the art to understand the term “generic definition” as comprising an ability to select between one of a plurality of levels of complexity of content presentation according to a determined capacity level of a receiving telephone. It is entirely appropriate when conducting claim construction, to rely heavily on the written description for guidance as to the meaning of the claims. Importantly, the person of ordinary skill in the art is deemed to read the claim term not only in the context of the particular claim in which the disputed term appears, but *in the context of the specification.* *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*). Indeed, the *Phillips* Court stressed that “the specification is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” *Id.* at 1315 (quotation omitted).

Contrary to the assertion of the office action, Tammy fails to disclose or suggest the claim limitation: “said generic definition incorporating common features of different services.”

Accordingly, Appellants’ claim 36 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tammy.

3. *All words in a claim must be considered.*

Appellants could not discern any reference that fairly suggests the above recitation. As articulated above, Tammy is completely silent with respect to such a feature. In order for the Examiner to arrive at such conclusion, apparently the phrase “generic definition, incorporating common features of different services” was not accorded any patentable weight within the context of the claims. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. (See MPEP §2143.03). One cannot divine claim meaning in a vacuum. *Philips v. AWH Corporation* (Fed. Cir. July 12, 2005). Further, as articulated above, the present application claims “said generic definition incorporating common features of different services,” which is neither taught nor fairly suggested by Tammy. Even if Tammy did teach generic definition, it does not teach the claimed feature “incorporating common features of different services.” The present application discloses a platform, which comprises a plurality of modules, each module carrying the generic definition together with a different arrangement of parameters to thereby combine different services within said platform. (See specification page 3, lines 25-29). Stated differently, as all of the services are provided as separate entities on separate servers, the present application claims features that allow different services to work together to complement each other. (See specification page 2, lines 11-15). Tammy and the novel features of the present application are worlds apart.

The Examiner acknowledges that Tammy discloses finding a restaurant and passing real-time information between the restaurant and the mobile user whereas the present application claims in part incorporating common features of different services.

4. *Broad Interpretation Inaccurate: The Examiner Relied On An Improper Hindsight Analysis.*

On page 4 of the November 6, 2009 Office Action, the Examiner contends that “Common features of different services” is broad in interpretation. Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection compensates for gaps and ambiguities in the teachings of the prior art by resorting to “broad interpretation” to improperly piece together the claimed invention using hindsight. In this case, it may be very hard to distinguish between broad interpretation and hindsight. “A factfinder should be aware, of

course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of argument reliant upon *ex post* reasoning.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 421. It is impermissible to use the claims as a framework from which to choose among individual references to recreate the claimed invention. *W. L. Gore Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1552-53, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 312 (Fed. Cir. 1983). This is a classic case where obviousness is deceptive in hindsight.

Measuring a claimed invention against the standard established by 35 U.S.C. §103 requires the difficult but critical step of casting the mind back to the time of invention, to consider the thinking of one of ordinary skill in the art, guided only by the prior art and then-accepted wisdom in the field. *Id.*, 721 F.2d at 1553, 220 U.S.P.Q. at 313. Close adherence to this methodology is especially important in the case of less technologically complex inventions, where the very ease with which the invention can be understood may prompt one “to fall victim to the insidious effect of a hindsight syndrome wherein that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher.” *Id.* As such, for at least these reasons, independent claim 36 is not rendered obvious by Tammy and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

5. Prior Art teaching not equivalent to claimed feature.

As articulated above, the Examiner contends that “Common features of different services” is broad in interpretation. The Examiner further states:

“Since Tammy discloses multiple services (see notes above such as “provisioning, discoverability, findability...”), let’s take “find-ability” service from Tammy as for example. Tammy’s “find-ability” has multiple common functions (features), such as finding restaurant (abstract), weather info (fig 4) and (fig 19) theatre or doctor.”

First, there is no perceptible relationship between the claimed feature and the cited passage.

Second, because the Examiner did not provide any explanation why the cited passage discloses the claimed feature other than the comment, Appellants reasonably conclude that the Examiner may believe the cited passage is equivalent to the claimed

feature. However, a *prima facie* case of equivalence is nonexistent in this case, because there is no factual basis to support the conclusion that these two elements at issue are equivalent. MPEP §2184 (II) states: “Among the indicia that will support a conclusion that one element is or is not an equivalent of another are:

(A) Whether the prior art element performs the identical function specified in the claim in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results as the corresponding element disclosed in the specification. *Kemco Sales, Inc. v. Control Papers Co.*, 208 F.3d 1352, 54 USPQ2d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

The present application discloses a platform, which comprises a plurality of modules, each module carrying the generic definition together with a different arrangement of parameters to thereby combine different services within said platform. (See specification page 3, lines 25-29). Stated differently, as all of the services are provided as separate entities on separate servers, the present application claims features that allow different services to work together to complement each other. (See specification page 2, lines 11-15). Tammy and the novel features of the present application are worlds apart.

The prior art element performs a different function as that specified in the claim in substantially the opposite way and produces substantially the opposite results as the corresponding element. Therefore, the test for “equivalence” is not satisfied since the first indicium does not support the conclusion that a claimed element is an equivalent. (emphasis added).

As such, for at least these reasons, independent claim 36 is not rendered obvious by Tammy and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

6. Improper claim construction.

On page 5 of the November 6, 2009 rejection, the Examiner appends a note next to the limitation: “An external parameter setting mechanism.” The note is reproduced here for ease of reference.

“Note: Applicant shows in “Appeal Brief” page 10 line 14-15: said mechanism is a mobile phone) for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition (Fig 19, page 34 L9-32:Reservation application (external) for inputting reservation (service) for restaurant,

doctor, dentist, theater, thereby invokes (instead of “implement”) a desired service (reservation) through reservation application (module) thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition (Fig 5-6, page 123, line 7-9) discloses implement a desired service. Applicant modules inside device 210 can be implemented by B2B developer, thereby to support (desired) new services and/or enhance existing services. (Page 13 line 26-28: subscriber can use his phone to develop new services through internet)”

It is not quite clear what the Examiner is trying to achieve here. However, what is quite clear is the Examiner looks for an anchor to rely on as teaching the claimed feature “an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition.” The MPEP makes clear that the intrinsic record (e.g., the specification) must be consulted to identify which of the different possible definitions is most consistent with the invention’s use of the terms. See MPEP §2111.01 (III) quoting *Brookhill-Wilk* 1, 334 F.3d at 1300, 67 USPQ2d at 113 (“Where there are several common meanings for a claim term, the patent disclosure serves to point away from the improper meanings and toward the proper meanings.”)

On page 3, at lines 22-24, the specification discloses the parameter to be a location and the parameter setting mechanism to be the platform itself, e.g., the mobile telephone. “Usually, the specification is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*).

As such, for at least these reasons, independent claim 36 is not rendered obvious by Tammy and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

7. *Rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements: Examiner's burden not met.*

The Examiner seems to believe there was an apparent reason to modify Tammy to produce the claimed subject matter; however, the Examiner did not cite any reference as bridging the gap between Tammy and Appellants’ claimed embodiments. (See November 6, 2009 Office Action, p. 6). Further, the Examiner did not cite any reference as providing the motivation let alone ‘some articulated reasoning with some rational

underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.' *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex, Inc.* 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Here, the Examiner simply stated:

"It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Tammy, and have (1) B2B developer implementing new service and (2) subscriber develops new service as taught by Tammy, thereby will provide real-time information between mobile station and fixed station as discussed by Tammy."

The Examiner attempted to provide a reason to modify the prior art in the fashion claimed, because the claimed subject matter cannot be fairly characterized as involving the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. However, the Examiner fails to provide some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness, the statement is merely conclusory. Accordingly, the Examiner's burden in making factual determinations set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966) is not met.

8. *Conclusion.*

Appellants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion in Tammy that would have resulted in Appellants' invention as provided in independent claim 36. Accordingly, independent claim 36 is not anticipated by Tammy and is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

A.2. Claims 45, 51 and 62.

Claims 45, 51 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy. Appellants urge to the contrary.

As articulated above with respect to claim 36, Tammy fails to teach exactly all elements of independent claims 45, 51 and 62 as required under 35 U.S.C. §102 for establishing a *prima facie* showing of anticipation. Independent claims 45, 51 and 62 recite at least some of the elements of independent claim 45, 51 and 62 that are discussed above. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent claims 45, 51 and 62 also are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) over Tammy. Set forth below are

additional reasons why Tammy does not anticipate the embodiments of independent claims 45, 51 and 62.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

A.1. Claims 37, 46, 59 and 63.

Claims 37, 46, 59 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claims 36 and 45 above, and further in view of Wenocur et al. Claims 59 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claims 58 and 62 above, and further in view of Montemer. Appellants urge to the contrary.

This ground of rejection applies only to dependent claims, and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 given Tammy as applied to independent claims 36, 45 and 61 above.

As articulated above with respect to claims 36, 45 and 61, there are missing claimed features not taught/suggested by the cited references – including “an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters.” (emphasis added). – and thus, dependent claims 37, 46, 59 and 63 have been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* showing of obviousness.

Therefore, Appellants’ claims 37, 46, 59 and 63 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tammy in view of Wenocur et al and in the case of claims 59 and 63 in view of Montemer.

A.2. Claims 54-57 and 60.

Claims 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claims 52 and 53 above, and further in view of Forstadius. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tammy as applied to claim 58 above, and further in view of Croome. Appellants urge to the contrary.

This ground of rejection applies only to dependent claims, and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 given Tammy as applied to independent claim 51 above.

As articulated above with respect to claim 51, there are missing claimed features not taught/suggested by the cited references – including “providing a generic definition of said service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services; selecting an appropriate one of said modules for the content delivery interface according to a currently desired service and said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.” (emphasis added). – and thus, dependent claims 54-57 and 60 have been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* showing of obviousness.

Therefore, Appellants’ claims 54-57 and 60 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tammy in view of Forstadius and in the case of claim 60 in view of Croome.

Conclusion

Thus, Appellants submit that all of the claims presently in the application are allowable.

For the reasons advanced above, Appellants respectfully urge that the rejection of claims 36-68 is improper. Reversal of the rejection of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/29/09



Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Wall & Tong, L.L.P.
595 Shrewsbury Ave.
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702
Telephone: (732) 842-8110 x120
Facsimile: (732) 842-8388
Attorney for Appellant(s)

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1-35. (Cancelled).

36. (Previously Presented) Apparatus providing a platform for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network, the apparatus comprising
an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters, wherein the infrastructure facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols; and

an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition, said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.

37. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, wherein said generic definition comprises an ability to select between one of a plurality of levels of complexity of content presentation according to a determined capability level of a receiving telephone.

38. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, carrying a plurality of services each defined using said generic service and different service defining parameters.

39. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, configured to allow a plurality of services to be defined using different service-defining parameters applied to said generic service.

40. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, further comprising a rule engine together with said generic definition, for operating logic required for said desired service by implementing ones of said service defining parameters that are logical rules.

41. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, further comprising an external

parameter obtaining mechanism to obtain external parameters for modifying application of a respective desired service to a user.

42. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 41, wherein said external parameter is location of a respective mobile telephone, and wherein said modifying comprises modifying said application in accordance with a respective location.

43. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, comprising a plurality of modules, each module carrying said generic definition together with a different arrangement of parameters, thereby to combine different services within said platform.

44. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 43, being able to support additional services by the incorporation of additional modules.

45. (Previously Presented) A method for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network comprising:

providing a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, and said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters wherein the cellular telephone network facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols, and

for each one of a plurality of desired services, inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.

46. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, wherein said generic definition comprises an ability to select between one of a plurality of levels of complexity of content presentation according to a determined capacity level of a receiving telephone.

47. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, comprising defining a plurality of

services each using said generic service and different service defining parameters, and providing each service as a separate module sharing a common interface.

48. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, further comprising operating logic required for a respective desired service by implementing ones of said service defining parameters that are logical rules.

49. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, further comprising obtaining external parameters for modifying application of a respective desired service to a user.

50. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 49, wherein said external parameter is location of a respective mobile telephone, and wherein said modifying comprises modifying said application in accordance with a respective location.

51. (Previously Presented) A method for managing a content delivery interface between a content provider and a subscriber wireless communication device, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of modules for the content delivery interface, each module for providing content as part of a different service wherein delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols is facilitated;

providing a generic definition of said service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services; selecting an appropriate one of said modules for the content delivery interface according to a currently desired service and said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices; and

adding said appropriate module to the content delivery interface, thereby to provide said currently desired service from a platform that supports a plurality of services.

52. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 51, wherein said adding said appropriate one of said modules comprises providing a functional alteration for the

content delivery interface for interacting with the wireless communication device, according to said currently desired service.

53. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, wherein said functional alteration comprises a change to a flow of interaction between the content delivery interface and the wireless communication device.

54. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, wherein said functional alteration comprises a change to the look and feel of the content delivery interface at the wireless communication device.

55. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 53, wherein said functional alteration comprises:

adding a new content type;

adding a new content delivery protocol; Adding a new device and adjusting the user interface to its browser and its display characteristics;

adding a new page;

adding content bundles that include multiple content items;

changing the look and feel of the service, including at least one of colors, fonts, icons, formatting and page layout; and

changing parameters of the service.

56. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, wherein said functional alteration comprises a change in a respective service according to an identity of a subscriber, a service package of said subscriber, a preference of said subscriber and a type of wireless communication device.

57. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 56, wherein said change comprises dynamic adaptation of the service, optionally including at least one of:

matching the output format and presentation to the device type;

filtering of content, based on at least one of permissions, compatibility to the device, subscriber preferences, and content classification;

selection of a language;

dynamic flow; and

adjustment of delivery protocol based on the content type and the device.

58. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, comprising providing each module with a generic service definition and customizing ones of said modules for services it is desired to provide.

59. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 58, wherein the content delivery interface further comprises a service directory for locating a service, such that said adding said appropriate module further comprises altering a listing in said service directory as necessary when a service is added, removed or altered.

60. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 58, wherein the content delivery interface further defines a presentation for providing an output of said service to the wireless communication device, such that said functional alteration comprises altering said presentation as necessary when a service is added, removed or altered.

61 (Previously Presented) The method of claim 58, wherein said functional alteration comprises altering a logic of said service.

62. (Previously Presented) A service delivery platform for an interface between a content provider and a wireless communication device, comprising:

a plurality of services for being provided to the wireless communication device by the content provider;

an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services;

a service controller for receiving a request for a service from the wireless communication device and for activating said service according to a service logic and

said generic definition, wherein said service logic comprises at least one rule for determining at least one of whether and how said service is to be provided; and

 a service framework, configured to enable ones of said services to be added, removed or changed.

63. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 62, further comprising a service directory for listing ones of said services, and wherein said service controller is configured to search said service directory for said service upon receiving said request.

64. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 62, wherein said service comprises a plurality of operations to be performed, and a response to be returned to the wireless communication device.

65. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 64, further comprising a presentation for presenting said response of said service.

66. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 65, wherein said presentation comprises a presentation assembler for collecting data and preparing said data for said response to the wireless communication device.

67. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 62, wherein an operation of said service is performed according to at least one rule.

68. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 67, further comprising a rule operation for constructing the condition for said rule.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.